

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-1431

FERUZA AMAN HUSEIN,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General of the United
States,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration
Appeals (A75-327-254)

Submitted: December 19, 2003

Decided: January 13, 2004

Before WIDENER, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Salim Ali, BECKER, HADEED, KELLOGG & BERRY, P.C., Springfield,
Virginia, for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney
General, Michael P. Lindemann, Assistant Director, Christopher C.
Fuller, Senior Litigation Counsel, Office of Immigration
Litigation, Civil Division, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Feruza Aman Husein, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, petitions this court for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals affirming without opinion the immigration judge's denial of asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture.* Husein contends that she provided detailed, consistent and plausible testimony sufficient to support her asylum claim. See 8 U.S.C.A. § 1158 (West 1999 & Supp. 2003); 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(42)(A) (2000). We have reviewed the record, the immigration judge's decision, and the Board's conclusion, and find that substantial evidence supports the immigration judge in his ruling that Husein failed to establish refugee status. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4) (2000); see Matter of Y-B-, 21 I. & N. Dec. 1136, 1139 (BIA 1998); Matter of S-M-J-, 21 I. & N. Dec. 722, 724-26 (BIA 1997). Therefore, we deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED

*Husein failed to argue her right to the latter two forms of relief on appeal, and thus has waived the issues. See Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(6); Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999); 11126 Baltimore Blvd., Inc. v. Prince George's County, Md., 58 F.3d 988, 993 n.7 (4th Cir. 1995).